DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 130 CS 008 884

TITLE Learning to Read through the Arts. Chapter 1 Developer/Demonstration Program, 1985-86. OEA Evaluation Section Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.

PUB DATE Jun 87

NOTE 64p.; Prepared by the Instructional Support Evaluation Unit. For earlier reports, see ED 260 155 and ED 278 007.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Childrens Art; Elementary Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Ability; Reading Achievement; Reading Attitudes; Reading Difficulties; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; Recreational Reading; Remedial Reading; Theater Arts; Visual Arts

IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Learning To Read Through the Arts Program; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

Released by the New York City Board of Education, this document reports on the success of the Learning to Read Through the Arts program for grades two through six during the 1985-86 school year. The first section introduces the Chapter 1 program, which was offered for 32 weeks at 6 different New York City sites, and explains how students are chosen for it, the program's objectives, and the scope of the report. The second section reports on evaluation questions and methodology, while the third section looks at program organization and implementation. The fourth section is comprised of interviews with the staff and students, suggestions for changes in the program, and an account of increased parental support through information provided at Parent Teacher Association and Parent Advisory Council meetings. The fifth section looks at student attendance and achievement in the program, and notes a statistically significant gain in reading achievement, particularly for fifth graders. The section also notes that students with limited proficiency in English and special education students also improved, with each group exceeding the targeted goals for skill mastery. The final section offers conclusions about the program's success and recommendations for future programs. Copies of the student questionnaire, the teacher survey, the staff questionnaire, the parent meeting observation form, and excerpts from student comments are appended. (JC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED285130

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT

Robert Tobias, Administrator
John Schoener, Senior Manager

June, 1987

CHAPTER I
DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM:
LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS
1985-86

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Guttenberg
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by the O.E.A.
Instructional Support
Evaluation Unit

Frank Guerrero,
Unit Manager

Sharon Walker,
Evaluation Project
Manager

Yvonne Spoerri,
Evaluation Consultant

CS 008 884

New York City Board of Education
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

Office of Educational Assessment
New York City Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

CHAPTER I DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM
LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS

EVALUATION SUMMARY, 1985-86

BACKGROUND

The Chapter I Developer/Demonstration Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) operates under the auspices of the Office of Special Projects of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction of the New York City Board of Education. It offers intensive reading instruction to Chapter I-eligible students through the integration of a total reading program with a total arts program. In 1985-86, the program operated with $968 thousand from Chapter I funds. The program was offered for a 32-week cycle from October, 1985 to June, 1986, at six sites, one each in Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and two in Staten Island. Chapter I-eligible general education and limited English proficient (LEP) children in grades two through six and their classroom teachers were bused to a program site in their borough two afternoons a week for four-hour L.T.R.T.A. sessions. Chapter I-eligible special education students attended L.T.R.T.A. one full day each week. A total of 832 general education students, 46 LEP students, and 102 special education students participated in the program.

EVALUATION METHODS

Reading performance of general education students was measured by the total reading scores on the California Achievement Test (CAT) (Fall), and the Degrees of Reading Power Test (D.R.P.) (Spring). A pretest-posttest design was used to measure fall-to-spring improvement. The criterion of success was a statistically significant gain from pretest to posttest. Reading performance of the LEP and special education students was measured by the criterion-referenced Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test. The criterion for program success was for 60 percent of the students to master a specified number of targeted skills -- five for LEP students and three for special education students. Students' writing performance was assessed by holistically scored writing samples. The criterion for program success was a statistically significant increase in writing scores from pretest to posttest. In addition, general education students were given two writing subtests of the CAT to measure language mechanics and language expression. The effect size (E.S.) of the average gains were calculated to determine whether the gains were educationally significant.

Student attitudes and progress were assessed by interviewing 200 students and by surveying participating classroom teachers and staff members. Parental involvement was measured by observing six L.T.R.T.A. Parent Advisory Council meetings.

FINDINGS

The overall mean gain for general education students on the reading achievement tests for the fall-to-spring comparison was 16 N.C.E.s.

Statistically significant average gains were found for each grade level. The criterion for success on the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test was met and exceeded by the LEP students, 75 percent of whom achieved mastery; a large majority (90 percent) of special education students also exceeded the mastery criterion.

All groups of students showed improvement in writing performance measured by pretest and posttest scores on a holistically scored writing sample. General education students made statistically significant mean gains at each grade level on the Language Mechanics and Language Expression subtests of the CAT.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions of the L.T.R.T.A. evaluation were:

- Program participation improved students' reading and writing skills.
- General education students' fall-to-spring mean gain on the reading achievement tests was greater than gains in previous years.
- Seventy-five percent of all LEP students mastered their targeted skills; therefore, the reading skills objective for LEP students was met. Special education students also exceeded the mastery criterion.
- Students' overall attitude towards the program was positive, and one-third of all students enjoyed reading more than any other L.T.R.T.A. activity.
- Both classroom teachers and staff members indicated that, in general, program participation had influenced students' self-esteem and behavior.
- The program had more success this year, as compared to previous years, in its attempt to reach parents by means of P.T.A./PAC meetings at home-schools and sites.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made for program improvement:

- Because success of the L.T.R.T.A. program depends on highly motivated personnel, all participating classroom teachers should be interested, enthusiastic volunteers, and the L.T.R.T.A. staff should be in a position to encourage the inclusion of such teachers.

- Since the largest number of parents attended an afternoon meeting, this schedule should be considered for continuing parental involvement.

- Since parents' concerns were achievement-oriented, at least one parent meeting should address test-preparation, L.T.R.T.A. recommended booklists, progress reports, and reinforcement of the program at home.

- The L.T.R.T.A. staff may want to provide parents with suggestions, guidance, and support for follow-up activities for subsequent years, when students will no longer participate in the L.T.R.T.A. Program.

- If possible, all written materials prepared for distribution to parents should be written in English, as well as in the language used by the parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this document is a result of a collaborative effort of full-time staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Sandra Ham devoted many hours visiting sites and collecting data, and Maria Cheung ably analyzed the data upon which this evaluation is based. Jonathan Goodman copyedited the manuscript, and Elias Rosario typed and corrected the manuscript. The Unit could not have produced this evaluation without their participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Background	1
	Eligibility	1
	Students Served	2
	Program Objectives	2
	Scope of this Report	4
II.	PROGRAM EVALUATION	5
	Evaluation Questions	5
	Evaluation Methodology	6
III.	PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION	10
	Program Organization	10
	Program Implementation	11
IV.	STUDENT AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM	12
	Student Interviews	12
	Staff Interviews	14
	Suggestions for Program Change	21
	L.T.R.T.A. Parent Advisory Council Meetings	21
V.	STUDENT OUTCOMES	25
	Attendance	25
	Academic Achievement Findings	25
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
	Conclusions	37
	Recommendations	38

APPENDICES

A:	Student Questionnaire	40
B:	Classroom Teacher Survey	43
C:	L.T.R.T.A. Staff Questionnaire	46
D:	PAC/P.T.A. Observation Form	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Continued

E: Criteria for Rating Student Responses on the Holistic Writing Test 50

F: Anecdotal Student Responses 51

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

		PAGE
Figure 1:	Schematic Evaluation Design for Outcome Measures.	8
Table 1:	Students served in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, by Grade: 1985-86	3
Table 2:	Percentage of Student Responses to Student Attitude Questionnaire for Sample Group.	13
Table 3:	Percentage of Student Responses to Student Attitude Questionnaire for Reading Entertainment, by Grade.	15
Table 4:	Percentage of Classroom Teachers Perceiving Change in Students' Attitudes and Behavior as a Function of Learning to Read Through the Arts.	18
Table 5:	Percentage of Staff Perceiving Change in Students' Attitudes and Behavior Scale as a Function of Learning to Read Through the Arts.	20
Table 6:	Mean Number of Days Absent for Learning to Read Through the Arts Students by Grade: 1985-86.	26
Table 7:	Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on Reading Achievement Tests: 1985-86.	27
Table 8:	Mean N.C.E. Gains of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, by Year on the California Achievement Test: 1980-81 through 1985-86.	28
Table 9:	Number and Percentage of LEP Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program Mastering Specified Numbers of Skills on the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test: 1985-86.	30
Table 10:	Number and Percentage of Special Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, Mastering Specified Number of Skills on the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test: 1985-86.	31
Table 11:	Mean Raw Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on a Holistically Scored Writing Test: 1985-86.	32

Table 12: Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on the Language Expression Subtest of the California Achievement Test: 1985-86. 34

Table 13: Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on the Language Mechanics Subtest of the California Achievement Test: 1985-86. 35

Table 14: Mean Raw Score Gains of LEP and Special Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on a Holistically Scored Writing Test: 1985-86. 36

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Chapter I Developer Demonstration Program, Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.), operates under the auspices of the Office of Special Projects of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction of the New York City Board of Education. The program has operated since 1971 and has received recognition at the national, state, and local levels as an exemplary program. L.T.R.T.A. uses artistic activities to stimulate student interest in reading and writing. In 1985-86, the program was funded with $968 thousand through E.C.I.A. Chapter I.

ELIGIBILITY

The test used to determine Chapter I eligibility was the previous spring's citywide reading test, the California Achievement Test (CAT). Pupils were eligible for Chapter I services if they scored at or below the following cut offs:

Grade	Cutoffs
2	2.4 Grade Equivalent (G.E.)*
3	3.1
4	3.9
5	4.7
6	5.7
7	6.7
8	7.7
9	8.7
10-12	Two or more years below grade level in reading

*A grade equivalent is the grade placement of students (year and month) for whom a given score is typical. Grade equivalents are not directly comparable across different tests. Moreover, because grade equivalents are not spaced equally apart, they cannot be used in arithmetic or statistical calculations. Most important, it is often assumed that a grade equivalent represents the level of work a student is capable of doing. For example, it may be assumed that a ninth grade student who obtains a grade

STUDENTS SERVED

The program served 832 second- through sixth-grade Chapter I-eligible children in general education classes, 46 limited English proficient students in these same grades, and 102 special education students (Table 1). Fifty-nine percent of the general education and LEP students who participated in the program were in grades three and four; 36 percent in grades two and five; and four percent in grade six.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The evaluation focused on the following program objectives:

1. General education L.T.R.T.A. students will make statistically significant mean gains in normal curve equivalent (N.C.E.)* total reading scores from pretest (administered by L.T.R.T.A. in October, 1985) to posttest (administered citywide in April, 1986) on reading achievement tests;

2. Sixty percent of all special education students will master at least three reading skills on the posttest of the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test that they had not mastered on the pretest, and 60 percent of all LEP students will master at least five skills that they had previously failed to master;

3. General education L.T.R.T.A. students will make statistically significant mean gains in N.C.E. scores on the Language Mechanics and Language Expression subtests of the CAT administered in October, 1985, and May, 1986;

(Continued)
equivalent of 11.6 belongs in the eleventh grade. This is not the case; a grade equivalent of 11.6 simply indicates that the student scored as well as a typical eleventh grader would have scored on the ninth-grade level test. This may indicate an above-average level of achievement, but does not indicate that the ninth grader is ready for eleventh-grade level work.

*N.C.E. scores are similar to percentile ranks but, unlike percentile ranks, are based on an equal-interval scale. These scores are based on a scale ranging from 1 to 99 with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of approximately 21. Because N.C.E. scores are equally spaced apart, arithmetic and statistical calculations such as averages are meaningful; in addition, comparisons of N.C.E. scores may be made across different achievement tests.

TABLE 1

Students Served in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, by Grade: 1985-86

Grade	Number of Students[a]	Percent
2	135	16
3	256	29
4	267	30
5	183	21
6	37	4
Total[b]	878	100

[a]These are general education and LEP students.

[b]The program also provided services to 102 ungraded special education students. Thus, 980 students were served during 1985-86.

- Three-fifths of the participating general education and LEP students were in grades three and four.

4. To increase average raw scores on holistically scored writing samples of students resulting in a statistically significant increase from pretest to posttest;

5. To ensure that during Parent Teachers Association/Parent Advisory Council (P.T.A./PAC) meetings parents will receive information enabling them to help their children with reading.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

Chapter I of this report reviews the program and its goals; Chapter II describes evaluation methods; Chapter III describes students' attitudes/progress and parental involvement; Chapter IV presents staff's perceptions of student progress and suggestions for change; Chapter V discusses findings concerning students' reading and writing performance; and Chapter VI offers conclusions and recommendations for program improvement.

II. PROGRAM EVALUATION

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Attitudes and Perceptions: The major foci of the 1985-86 evaluation were to assess students' attitudes toward L.T.R.T.A. and their academic progress through objective assessment and staff perceptions. The specific evaluation questions were as follows:

1. What are the students' attitudes toward the L.T.R.T.A. program?
2. What are classroom teachers' attitudes about their experiences at the L.T.R.T.A. site? How do classroom teachers and L.T.R.T.A. staff view students' progress?
3. Are L.T.R.T.A. staff members able to reach parents with children in the program by means of Parent Teacher Association/Parent Advisory Council meetings at various schools? How do parents respond to this approach?

Student Achievement Data: To evaluate the impact of the program on L.T.R.T.A. students the following questions were asked:

1. Have general education students made statistically significant mean N.C.E. gains in Total Reading from pre- to posttest using the California Achievement Test as a pretest and the Degrees of Reading Power Test as a posttest?
2. Have general education students made statistically significant mean N.C.E. gains on the Language Mechanics and Language Expression subtests of the California Achievement Test?
3. Have L.T.R.T.A. students shown a statistically significant mean increase on their holistically scored writing samples from pretest to posttest?
4. Have 60 percent of special education students mastered at least three reading skills which they had failed on the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test? Have 60 percent of LEP students mastered at least five skills which they had previously failed to master?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Program Implementation: Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) staff documented the program's implementation by: 1) interviewing students; 2) observing workshops; 3) surveying classroom teachers; and 4) attending PAC meetings during which L.T.R.T.A. staff informed parents about the program. All six L.T.R.T.A. sites were visited. The site visits, observations, and surveys took place from January through May, 1986.

Data Sources: Evaluation of the L.T.R.T.A. Program, 1985-86, was based on the following data sources:

- A three-page Student Questionnaire was used to interview approximately 20 percent (N = 200) of all students in the program. Evaluators selected random proportionate-to-size samples by grade and site. The questionnaire recorded information on students' overall attitudes and behavior within the L.T.R.T.A. Program -- specifically their attitude towards reading (Appendix A).

- A 10-item Classroom Teacher Interview Form was mailed to all of the participating L.T.R.T.A. classroom teachers to describe their experiences at the L.T.R.T.A. site, and their assessment of students' progress, as a result of participation in the program (Appendix B).

- A Staff Interview Form, almost identical to the Classroom Teacher Interview Form, was administered to all L.T.R.T.A. staff members, addressing largely the same issues as those mentioned on the teachers' form (Appendix C).

- The evaluation team attended six PAC meetings at various home schools in each of the five boroughs. A six-item Parent Meeting Observation Form was used to determine parents' interests and responses to the L.T.R.T.A. Program's staff (Appendix D).

Outcomes: The reading achievement of general education students in grades three through six was assessed by comparing their pretest scores on the CAT and posttest scores on the Degrees of Reading Power Test (D.R.P.). L.T.R.T.A. students in second grade were posttested with the Metropolitan Achievement Test (M.A.T.). The tests covered the period from October, 1985 to April, 1986; the April test was given as part of the Citywide Testing Program. The M.A.T. and D.R.P. scores were converted to CAT scores. All pretest and posttest scores were converted to N.C.E.s for comparison purposes (Figure 1).

Model A, one recommended approach for Chapter I evaluations, was used to analyze pretest and posttest data for general education students. According to this norm-referenced model, it is expected that, without treatment, a student's N.C.E. score on pretest and posttest will be the same, i.e., under no-treatment conditions a student is expected to remain in the same position relative to other students. If the N.C.E. score on the posttest is significantly greater than the score on the pretest, the gain can be attributed to the effectiveness of the program.

Correlated t-tests were used to determine if the mean differences between pre- and posttest data were statistically significant. An effect size (E.S.)* indicating the educational meaningfulness of the mean gain or loss for each comparison was also calculated.

---

*The effect size, developed by Jacob Cohen, is the ratio of the mean gain to the standard deviation of the gain. This ratio provides an index of improvement in standard deviation units irrespective of the size of the sample. According to Cohen, 0.2 is a small E.S., 0.5 is a moderate E.S., and 0.8 is considered to be a large E.S. Only effect sizes of 0.8 and above are considered to be educationally meaningful, reflecting the importance of the gains in the students' educational development.

FIGURE 1

Schematic Evaluation Design
for Outcome Measures

Program Area	Test Name	Students	Pretest Date	Posttest Date	Criteria of Success
Reading	CAT[a] D.R.P.[b] M.A.T.[b]	General education	10-85	4-86	Statistically significant mean N.C.E.[c] gain and educationally meaningful effect size
Reading	Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test	Special education and LEP	10-85 10-85	5-86 5-86	Mastery of 3 Skills Mastery of 5 Skills
Writing	CAT Language Mechanics and Language Expression subtests	General education	10-85	5-86	Statistically significant mean N.C.E. gain and educationally meaningful effect size
Writing	Holistic scored writing sample	General education, special education, and LEP	10-85	5-86	Statistically significant mean gain and educationally meaningful effect size

[a]CAT (Total Reading Score), Form C, Levels 12 to 16 for grades two through six, respectively.

[b]D.R.P., Form PB, Level 8 for grades three and four, Level 6 for grade five, and Level 1 for grade six, and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (M.A.T.), Form L, Level Primary II for grade two.

[c]The D.R.P. and M.A.T. raw scores were equated to CAT scores and then converted to N.C.E. scores.

Achievement for LEP and special education students was measured with the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test, a criterion-referenced reading test. Sixty percent of LEP students were expected to master five skills on the posttest which they had failed on the pretest. Sixty percent of the special education students were expected to master three additional skills as gauged by pretest and posttest scores.

Writing: L.T.R.T.A. students' writing was assessed with narrative writing samples that pupils wrote in October, 1985, and May, 1986. A holistic scoring system (see Appendix E) was used to grade the writing samples. The writing samples were graded with scores from zero to eight based on two readers' judgements of the clarity, the plan of organization, and the development of the topic in an interesting way. General education students were also administered standardized writing subtests of the CAT in Language Mechanics and Language Expression. The program's criteria were significant mean gains in student scores from pre- to posttest.

Correlated t-tests were used to determine if the mean differences between pre- and posttest scores were statistically significant. In addition, the E.S. was calculated to determine the educational meaningfulness of the mean gain or loss for each comparison.

III. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

The Chapter I Developer/Demonstration Program: Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) was offered for a 32-week cycle from October, 1985, to June, 1986. A total of 832 general education students, 46 LEP students, and 102 Chapter I-eligible special education students participated in the 1985-86 program.

The L.T.R.T.A. Program is associated with the Staten Island Children's Museum, the Bronx Museum of the Arts, the New York Aquarium, the Brooklyn Museum, Ballet Hispanico of New York, El Museo del Barrio, New York Botanical Garden, and Business and Industry for the Arts in Education, Inc., by way of field trips and workshops. In 1985-86, the program operated at six sites, one each in Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and two in Staten Island. Participating general education and LEP students were bused to the program site in their borough, except for Staten Island, two afternoons a week for four-hour L.T.R.T.A. sessions, while special education students attended L.T.R.T.A. one full day each week. Special education and LEP students were taught the same curriculum as general education students, but at a slower pace, and thus did not necessarily cover the same amount of material.

The Manhattan, Bronx, and Brooklyn sites each had two reading teachers, three artist teachers, and one office aide. The Queens and Staten Island sites each had two reading teachers, two artist teachers, and one office aide. (The staff in Staten Island divided their time between two sites.) At each site, one of the teachers acted as assistant coordinator, while another teacher served as head teacher. The main office,

housed at the Manhattan site, was staffed by the program director, three teacher trainers, a word processor, and three office aides.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The L.T.R.T.A. Program uses three forms of staff training for classroom teachers, staff members, and assistant coordinators. The objective of all training is to share information and learn to implement the program at these various levels.

At each of the six sites, students participated in individual and small-group reading workshops that focused on word-attack skills, comprehension, study skills, reasoning, problem-solving, literacy appreciation, and recreational reading. In addition to the reading instruction, students also participated in two reading-oriented art workshops. Each site offered workshops in at least three of the following arts activities: dance, printmaking, photography, mixed media, painting, and music. As part of each workshop, students incorporated language skills into their art work by recording their experiences in journals. Language skills that were taught included comprehension skills, specialized vocabulary used on norm-referenced tests, and creative writing, as well as reading for information, appreciation, and/or pleasure. Student journals provided an additional writing exercise and enabled participants to note their experiences in their own words.

IV. STUDENT AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

STUDENT INTERVIEWS

The O.E.A. evaluation team visited each of the five L.T.R.T.A. sites from January through April, 1986, to interview L.T.R.T.A. students. Two-hundred students (about 20 percent) in the program were selected so that a proportionate number of students per grade per site were represented. All three components were included. Each interview took approximately 10 minutes. The O.E.A. team used a three-page, 13-item questionnaire that addressed the following issues: 1) the students' own perception of change in their attitudes and behavior as a result of program participation; 2) students' overall attitude towards the program; and 3) change in students' attitude toward reading (Appendix A).

Half of all students said they would like to have more L.T.R.T.A. classes, and 41 percent liked the current amount of time they spent in the program. When asked what they liked best about the program, students mentioned arts and reading (30 percent) followed by dancing (27 percent) and music (nine percent). This indicates that one-third of all students liked reading as much as art or all other activities. Most students did not mention any negative aspects of the program, and most of those who did have criticism mentioned occasional (warranted) disciplinary actions taken during the program.

Students rated changes in their behavior and attitudes as follows (see Table 2):

- o sixty-seven percent liked coming to school more;
- o sixty-four percent responded that their grades had gotten better;
- o fifty-six percent felt that they liked themselves better;

TABLE 2

Percentage of Student Responses to Student Attitude Questionnaire for Sample Group[a]

Question: Since Being In L.T.R.T.A.,	Students' Response			Don't Know
My attendance has	gotten better	stayed same	gotten worse	
	43%	51%	4%	2%
I like coming to school	more	the same	less	
	67	31	2	--
I feel my teachers care	more about me	the same about me	less about me	
	56	40	3	1
I like myself	better	the same	less	
	56	40	4	--
My grades have	gotten better	stayed same	gotten worse	
	64	8	4	24

[a]Total number of sampled students was 200 (approximately 20 percent of all L.T.R.T.A. students). Students were randomly selected proportionate to number per grade at each site.

- A majority of sampled participants believed that: they like coming to school more (67 percent); their teachers care more about them (56 percent); they like themselves better (56 percent); and their grades have improved (64 percent).

- o fifty-six percent responded that they felt their teachers cared more about them; and
- o forty-three percent reported that their attendance had increased.

In general, students reported that reading was exciting, instructive, and helped them pass tests. Ninety-eight percent of all students reported that they read some type of book for fun at home, and most listed comic books as their second favorite choice (83 percent). The percentage of students reading a newspaper was positively related to grade: 20 percent of students in grade two read newspapers, whereas 69 percent of students in grade six did so. All sixth graders reported that they read some kind of magazine (Table 3). Students commended reading teachers for their original approach to reading, which induced students to visit libraries and use them more frequently. Students' answers could be interpreted as socially appropriate responses.

STAFF INTERVIEWS

O.E.A. developed two very similar questionnaires for classroom teachers and L.T.R.T.A. staff members. Both questionnaires addressed the following issues: 1) overall attitude about experiences at the L.T.R.T.A. site; 2) assessment of students' progress; 3) gains expected for students, for teachers, and staff members as a result of program participation; and 4) suggestions for change.

Classroom Teacher Questionnaire

A ten-item questionnaire was mailed to participating classroom teachers in March, 1986 (see Appendix B). Sixty-four percent of the teachers, a moderately high respondence rate, returned it.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Student Responses to Student Attitude Questionnaire, for Reading Entertainment, by Grade

	What do you read for fun?				
Grade	Books	Comics	Magazines	Newspapers	Other
2	100%	87%	40%	20%	3%
3	100	76	67	42	11
4	96	79	53	63	11
5	93	88	53	60	1
6	100	85	100	69	7
TOTAL	98	83	63	51	7

- Almost all students read books for fun outside of a school-setting.
- Eighty-three percent of the students prefer comic books.

Most teachers in the L.T.R.T.A. program were first-year participants. Many of the veteran L.T.R.T.A. teachers were involved in teaching the special education component. When asked what expectations they had for themselves as a result of participating in the program, one-third of those responding mentioned learning new or improving existing teaching skills. A few teachers expected help in developing students' reading sensitivity and exploring creativity; they also looked forward to working intensively with individual students.

Seventy-eight percent of the teachers expected to see improvement in students' reading skills, 26 percent expected an appreciation and improvement in art, and 17 percent expected improvement in writing. They further mentioned that L.T.R.T.A. students would be more motivated to learn, would be more interested in reading, and would benefit academically from small-group instruction. All but two teachers, felt that the expectations they had for both themselves and their students had been met. They added that, as a result of the program, they now were able to express themselves more creatively, were using new teaching methods, and enjoyed working with other talented and dedicated teachers.

When asked how student behavior, attitudes, and achievement had been influenced as a result of participation, the teachers had a varied list of perceptions. They thought that students were better disciplined, better behaved, and had more self-confidence. Students have made progress in reading, writing, and use of vocabulary. Better reading skills and self-esteem were quoted by L.T.R.T.A. teachers as the greatest improvements. Special education students seemed to benefit especially from participation in the program for two years. According to their teachers, bilingual

students who were given special opportunities to be creative increased their self-esteem.

Except for two teachers who had responded negatively, all of the teachers hoped to participate again. The evaluators believe that program staff should try to screen out dissatisfied teachers in the beginning of the year, since the teachers' negative response to the program serves neither them nor their students, and their cooperation and enthusiasm are important aspects in the L.T.R.T.A. program.

The last item on the questionnaire asked the classroom teachers to rate ten student attitudes and behaviors. They reported that the students' greatest improvements were (see Table 4):

- o works more efficiently when working alone than previously (90 percent);
- o shows greater satisfaction with completed schoolwork and art products (86 percent);
- o takes greater part in class discussion (86 percent);
- o reads more on own initiative (71 percent);
- o reads more for pleasure (71 percent); and
- o has less disicipline problems (71 percent).

Staff Questionnaire

A nine-item questionnaire was given to the 18 L.T.R.T.A. staff members* during site visits (see Appendix C). All of them returned the questionnaire. Eight new staff members joined the L.T.R.T.A. program this year, and five veteran members have been with the program as long as eight years. The staff members expected to gain experience in their various

*The L.T.R.T.A. staff comprises assistant coordinators, head teachers, teacher trainers, artist teachers, and reading teachers.

TABLE 4

Percentage of Classroom Teachers Perceiving Change in Students' Attitudes and Behavior as a Function of Learning to Read Through the Arts

Student Attitude/Behavior	Degree of Change: Great Improvement/ Improvement	No Change	Don't Know
1. Attends school more frequently	58%	42%	0%
2. Works on a task until completed	68	25	7
3. Works more efficiently when working alone than previously	90	10	0
4. Shows greater satisfaction with completed school work and art products	86	14	0
5. Takes greater part in class discussion	86	14	0
6. Reads a wider range of books than previously	67	33	1
7. Talks more about books	52	43	5
8. Reads more on own initiative	71	25	4
9. Reads more for pleasure	71	25	4
10. Has less discipline problems	71	25	4

[a]Twenty classroom teachers returned the questionnaire.

- At least three-fourths of the teachers rated the following items as having improved: works more efficiently when working alone than previously (90 percent); showing greater satisfaction with completed school work and art products (86 percent); takes greater part in class discussion (86 percent); and reads a wider range of books than previously (76 percent).

fields and learn how to integrate the arts with language instructions. For their students, they expected an improvement in reading and writing skills in order to enhance self-esteem; assistance in overcoming failure; and an increase in their appreciation and comprehension of the arts. Staff members unanimously believed that their expectations were met: they gained more teaching experience, and students gained new skills and learned new concepts about the arts. The staff members' responses reinforced the classroom teachers' perceptions that participation in the program had influenced the overall behavior of students, increased their self-esteem, and decreased discipline problems.

In general, staff members rated changes in attitudes and behavior higher than did classroom teachers. At least ninety-five percent of staff reported that students had made improvement in taking greater part in class discussion; that students showed greater satisfaction with completed schoolwork and art products; and, that students showed greater self-esteem, (Table 5). They also noted improvement in: use of verbal skills; working on a task until completed; working more efficiently when working alone than previously; and having less discipline problems. Except for the students' obvious improvement in reading skills, L.T.R.T.A. staff were unable to mention any one single improvement as more important than the rest. Staff believed that special education students especially benefited from the program, since reading instruction related reading materials to an experience in art. Bilingual students, who were said to feel less inferior as a result of the program, benefited from a different classroom environment that exposed them to a growing number of unusual words.

TABLE 5

Percentage of Staff Perceiving Change in Students' Attitudes and Behavior as a Function of Learning to Read Through the Arts

As a result of L.T.R.T.A. program participation from September to February, rate the following items concerning students' attitudes and behavior:

	Great Improvement/ Improvement	No Change	Don't Know
1. Works on a task until completed	84%	5%	11%
2. Works more efficiently when working alone than previously	89	0	11
3. Shows greater satisfaction with completed school work and art products	95	0	5
4. Takes greater part in class discussion	95	0	5
5. Talks more about books	48	37	15
6. Reads more on own initiative	58	5	37
7. Reads more for pleasure	42	5	53
8. Clearly shows greater self-esteem	100	0	0
9. Is more expressive	95	5	0
10. Has less discipline problems	89	11	0

[a]Twenty staff members returned the questionnaire, one staff member felt rating did not apply to her field of expertise and therefore was not included in outcomes.

- All L.T.R.T.A. staff reported that students showed greater self-esteem.
- Ninety-five percent of the staff members indicated students take greater part in class discussion; and 95 percent reported an improvement in showing greater satisfaction with completed school-work and art products; and taking greater part in class discussion; and being more expressive.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAM CHANGE

Both staff and classroom teachers offered suggestions for change* in the program that would benefit the students. Classroom teachers offered the following suggestions:

- Extend the duration of the program and include more classes.
- Have students take materials home to reinforce learning skills.
- Have special education students share and display newly acquired artistic skills in their home schools.
- Conduct a teacher workshop in September to assist teachers in implementing the program at the home school.
- Expose students to lengthier literature/books.

Seven staff members offered the following suggestions that would benefit students:

- Extend the length of the program for all students to two years.
- Expand the duration of the program sessions and increase personnel.
- Have specific programs for students with special interests.

L.T.R.T.A. PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETINGS

In previous years the number of parents participating in workshops at the L.T.R.T.A. sites was small, so, this year, program staff for the most part informed parents about the program at the home schools. Information was given out at P.T.A./PAC meetings. This new approach succeeded in involving more parents in the program. The evaluation team observed six PAC meetings at various schools to determine the extent of parental

---

*Some of these suggestions may not be realistic within the limitations of the L.T.R.T.A Program's budget.

involvement and the success of this new approach. Findings were recorded on a two-page observation form that dealt with parents' understanding of and response to L.T.R.T.A. information (Appendix D).

The number of parents present varied at each school from as few as three to as many as 17, with an average of seven parents per school. The largest number, 17 parents, were present at a late afternoon PAC meeting. The parents were able to pick up their children after the meeting, which may have enhanced attendance (all other meetings were scheduled during morning hours); therefore, it is suggested that meetings be scheduled later in the day and parents be provided, as is currently the case, with at least two weeks' advance notice so that they can adjust other commitments and come to the meetings.

In all six cases, the L.T.R.T.A. coordinators addressed the parents; occasionally they were assisted by a reading teacher. Parents were given varied information about the L.T.R.T.A. Program: the themes and goals of the program, description of tests and class trips, explanation and samples of writing journals, and an overall evaluation of students. In addition to this verbal information, L.T.R.T.A. staff gave sample workshops and lessons for parents to participate in, showed slides, and conducted site tours. Parents seemed to enjoy activities stressing the visual involvement and showed a keen interest in the program. They also responded by discussing their children's growing interest in books, their appreciation of field trips, and the creative use of reading games in the L.T.R.T.A. Program.

At all schools, parents were eagerly soliciting additional information. One of their main concerns was how to prepare for the various upcoming tests. This indicated that parents were achievement-oriented, and

in the future the program might use at least one parent meeting to address such concerns (students could bring home a written notice of a parent meeting addressing test preparation). In addition to this issue, parents asked for specific L.T.R.T.A.-recommended booklists; wanted to know how progress was graded; wanted to receive progress reports; and asked how they could reinforce the program at home. Parents also discussed the impact of the L.T.R.T.A. Program upon their children at home, reporting that their children taught their peers newly acquired skills, and improved in their homework. Bilingual parents noted that their children spoke more English at home as a result of program participation. Parents also indicated that they wanted to accompany students on trips in the future and hoped for additional years of program participation.

Based on parents' responses, O.E.A. developed a series of suggestions to implement in future workshops/meetings. It was suggested that L.T.R.T.A. schedule an initial workshop for parents which would outline the program's goals; provide a framework of expectations and activities for each meeting/workshop; and offer suggestions for using L.T.R.T.A. activities with their children at home. Another suggestion indicated that staff would provide parents with ideas, guidance, and support for follow-up activities for subsequent years, when their children would no longer be participating in the L.T.R.T.A. Program. It was also recommended that the staff provide suggestions for activities designed to reinforce reading and writing skills. In addition, the staff could prepare a compilation and description of free and low-cost resources within the city, for parents to use with their children, e.g., library reading hours, special events, and children's theater. There are long-standing New York City resources that may be gen-

erally used as sources for conversation and imaginative writing, as well as for artistic expression, including museums, street fairs, flea markets, subway- and bus-rides, ferries, bridges, parks, etc. The evaluation team indicated that, if possible, all written materials prepared for distribution to parents should be written in English, as well as in the language used by the parents.

V. STUDENT OUTCOMES

ATTENDANCE

Overall, the mean percentage of days* attended for L.T.R.T.A. students was 86 percent. The percentage of days attended ranged from 82 percent to 89 percent. The mean number of days absent for students was 6.0 days. The mean number of days absent for each grade was as follows: grade two, 5.5.; grade three, 8.7; grade four, 6.9; grade five, 6.6; grade six, 5.0; and special education students, 3.0 (see Table 6).

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FINDINGS

Reading Skills

General Education Students. Table 7 shows the mean pretest and post-test N.C.E. scores in total reading for the 690 general education students in the L.T.R.T.A. Program. It includes complete data on the CAT, administered in October, 1985; and the D.R.P., administered in April, 1986. The mean pretest-posttest gain in the total reading score across grades was 16 N.C.E.s. This gain reflects a statistically significant improvement in reading achievement by students participating in the L.T.R.T.A. Program. The greatest gain was achieved by fifth graders, who had an average gain of 18.9 N.C.E.s. The smallest gain was made by third graders, with a mean gain of 13 N.C.E.s. The mean differences were statistically significant as well as educationally meaningful. This year's overall mean gain was greater than gains in previous years (Table 8).

---

*The maximum number of days of attendance was 45 for general education and LEP students. The maximum number of days of attendance for special education students was 27, since they only attended the program once a week.

TABLE 6

Mean Number of Days Absent for
Learning to Read Through the Arts
Students by Grade: 1985-86

Grade	Days Absent[a]			Mean Percent of Days[b] Attended
	Mean	Median	S.D.	
2	5.5	4.0	5.4	88%
3	8.7	6.0	8.9	82
4	6.9	4.0	7.7	85
5	6.6	3.0	8.7	85
6	5.0	3.0	5.9	89
Special Education	3.0	2.0	3.2	89

[a]The maximum number of days of attendance was 45 for general education and LEP students. The maximum number of days of attendance for special education students was 27.

[b]Citywide attendance for New York City pupils was 85.6 percent for the 1985-86 school year.

- All students had attendance rates of 82 percent or above.
- The highest percent of attendance, 89 percent, was in grade six and special education.

TABLE 7

Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on Reading Achievement Tests[a]: 1985-86

Grade	Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference[b]		Effect Size
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
2	116	25.1	19.0	42.4	16.0	17.3	17.2	1.0
3	183	27.3	14.4	40.3	18.0	13.0	13.6	1.0
4	221	26.4	13.5	42.1	13.2	15.7	14.5	1.1
5	141	33.2	15.5	52.1	11.4	18.9	13.5	1.4
6	29	28.1	7.5	45.5	6.8	17.4	5.5	3.2
Total	690	27.9	15.2	43.9	15.1	16.0	14.0	1.1

[a]Pretest results were scores on the CAT. Posttest results were scores on D.R.P. Test. All pretest and posttest scores were converted to N.C.E.s for comparison purposes.

[b]These differences were statistically significant at $p<.001$ level.

- Mean gains for all grades exceeded seven N.C.E. points, the expected criterion for national exemplary projects.
- All gains were educationally meaningful.

TABLE 8

Mean N.C.E. Gains of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program, by Year on the California Achievement Test: 1980-81 through 1985-86

Year	Total Number of Students	N.C.E. Gain
1985-86	690	16.0
1984-85	649	13.9
1983-84	527	13.1
1982-83	677	12.0
1981-82	840	12.0
1980-81	1,130	13.0

- Overall, this year's mean gain was greater than gains in previous years.

LEP and Special Education Students. On the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test, LEP students were assigned five target skills, and special education students were assigned three target skills to master by the end of the program. The criterion for program success was that 60 percent of the students in each group would master at least the targeted number of skills.

Seventy-five percent of all of the LEP students mastered at least five skills (see Table 9). This percentage met the mastery criterion. A large majority of special education students (90 percent), achieved the mastery criterion of three skills (see Table 10).

Writing Achievement

General Education Students. Improvement in writing was assessed in part by examining students' scores on holistically scored writing samples. These samples were collected in October, 1985, and May, 1986. The writing samples were evaluated for organization of ideas, use of support materials, sentence variety, vividness of language, and general mechanics (a grading metric is included as Appendix E). These writing samples were given scores of zero to four by two raters, which, when added together, gave each student a score between zero and eight.

The small range of the scoring scale and the resulting low numerical values of the scores should not obscure the consistent writing improvement of general education students (Table 11). The average gains ranged from 1.3 points for fifth-graders to 1.8 points for sixth-graders. The overall mean gain was 1.6 points. All mean gains were statistically significant and educationally meaningful.

TABLE 9

Number and Percentage of LEP Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program Mastering Specified Number of Skills on the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test: 1985-86

Grade	Number of Students	Number of Targeted Skills[a] 1 - 2 %	3 %	4 %	5 or more %
3	20	5%	10%	5%	80%
4	15	13	20	7	60
5	6	17	0	0	83
6	3	0	0	0	100
Total	44	9	11	5	75

[a]The number of targeted skills for LEP students was five.

- All grades met or exceeded the student mastery criterion (60 percent of the students mastered at least five skills).
- Overall, 75 percent of the LEP students mastered five or more skills. This exceeded the program's objective for LEP students.

TABLE 10

Number and Percentage of Special Education Students
in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program
Mastering Specified Number of Skills on the Wisconsin Design
Skills Development Test: 1985-86

Number of Skills[a]	N	Percent
1 - 2	10	10
3 or more	92	90
Total	102	100

[a]The number of targeted skills for special education students was three.

- Ninety percent of the special education students met the criterion of mastering at least three targeted skills.

TABLE 11

Mean Raw Scores of General Education Students
in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program
on a Holistically Scored Writing Test: 1985-86[a]

Grade	Number of Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference[b]		Effect Size
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
2	118	1.3	0.9	2.9	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.1
3	178	1.9	1.0	3.5	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.1
4	211	1.9	1.1	3.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.3
5	149	3.2	1.0	4.5	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.1
6	29	3.2	0.7	5.0	0.9	1.8	0.8	2.3
Total	685	2.1	1.2	3.7	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.2

[a]New York City Board of Education, "Supplementary Training Packet for Holistic Scoring. Spring, 1985."

[b]These differences were statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level.

- Students improvement in writing was statistically significant for all grades.
- All gains were educationally meaningful.

General education students' writing was also assessed on the Language Expression and Language Mechanics subtests of CAT (Tables 12 and 13). Mean gains in the Language Expression Subtest ranged from ten N.C.E.s in third-grade students to 13.7 N.C.E.s in second-grade students. The overall mean gain was 12.3 N.C.E. points. All these mean differences were statistically significant. In terms of educational meaningfulness, these gains were moderate to large.

Mean gains in the Language Mechanics subtest ranged from 11.4 N.C.E.s in grade five to 22.1 N.C.E. points for students in grade three. The overall mean gain was 17.4 N.C.E.s. All these mean differences were statistically significant, and gains were found to be generally educationally meaningful. Improvement was greater on the Language Mechanics subtest than on the Language Expression subtest.

LEP and Special Education Students. LEP and special education students were also administered the holistically scored writing test. LEP students showed an overall mean gain of 1.9 points. This overall gain was statistically significant and educationally meaningful. The gains made by LEP students were educationally meaningful for all grades.

The 93 special education students who took the writing test showed an improvement of 1.7 points in their test performance. This gain was educationally meaningful and statistically significant (see Table 14).

TABLE 12

Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students
in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program
on the Language Expression Subtest of the
California Achievement Test: 1985-86

Grade	Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference[a]		Effect Size
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
2	120	28.0	18.0	41.7	12.7	13.7	20.5	0.7
3	191	28.6	14.3	38.7	13.0	10.1	13.8	0.7
4	224	26.4	14.1	39.5	11.7	13.1	13.6	1.0
5	152	33.3	14.7	46.5	18.0	13.2	16.7	0.8
6	29	27.3	11.5	39.6	8.6	12.3	9.8	1.3
Total	716	28.8	15.1	41.1	13.9	12.3	15.6	0.8

[a]These differences were statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level.

- Mean differences ranged from 10.1 to 13.7 N.C.E.s. The overall mean gain was 12.3 N.C.E.s.
- Student improvement in writing was statistically significant for all grades.
- All gains were educationally moderate to large.

TABLE 13

Mean N.C.E. Scores of General Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on the Language Mechanics Subtest of the California Achievement Test: 1985-86

Grade	Students	Pretest		Posttest		Difference[a]		Effect Size
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
2	120	25.0	17.2	44.1	18.3	19.1	18.7	1.0
3	190	26.3	15.2	48.4	16.4	22.1	17.8	1.2
4	225	27.6	16.2	44.9	14.8	17.3	16.0	1.1
5	150	35.1	15.0	46.5	15.4	11.4	16.2	0.7
6	29	36.6	14.8	49.2	8.9	12.6	9.3	1.4
Total	714	28.8	16.2	46.2	15.8	17.4	17.2	1.0

[a]These differences were statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level.

- Mean gains ranged from 11.4 to 22.1 N.C.E.s. The overall mean gain was 17.4 N.C.E.s.
- All mean gains were statistically significant.
- All gains were educationally moderate to large.

TABLE 14

Mean Raw Score Gains of LEP and Special Education Students in the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program on a Holistically Scored Writing Test: 1985-86

Population	Number of Students	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	Difference[a] Mean	Difference[a] S.D.	Effect Size
LEP	19	0.6	1.0	2.5	0.8	1.9	0.8	2.4
Special Ed.	93	1.6	1.4	3.3	1.4	1.7	0.9	1.9

[a]Mean differences were statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level.

- LEP students improved an average of 1.9 points on the holistically scored writing test, while special education students gained 1.7 points.
- These changes were statistically significant as well as educationally meaningful.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of all data for students in the 1985-86 L.T.R.T.A. Program indicates that the program met, and in many cases, exceeded its evaluation objectives. According to the test results and L.T.R.T.A. staff and classroom teacher's observations, the L.T.R.T.A. Program was successful in producing gains in students' reading and writing achievement, as well as in behavior and general attitudes towards school.

General education students showed statistically significant mean gains in reading skills as measured by the fall-to-spring testing. Their overall reading mean gains were greater than in previous years. They also demonstrated average gains in writing achievement as measured by a holistically scored writing test.

LEP students participating in the program reached mastery criterion of reading skills on a criterion-referenced test. It was expected that 60 percent of these students would reach criterion; instead, 75 percent achieved mastery. Special education students participating in the program also showed improvement in reading and writing skills on both the criterion-referenced test and the holisticallly-scored writing test.

Half of the interviewed L.T.R.T.A. students wanted to increase the hours of program participation, and one-third of all students reported that they enjoyed reading as much as any other activity. Most students liked coming to school better and believed their grades had increased as a result of program participation. They reported that reading was exciting, instructive, and helped them pass tests. Ninety-eight percent reported to read some type of book for fun outside of a school-setting. Many of the

students commended the teachers for their original approach to reading, which in turn induced the students to visit libraries and read more frequently.

Both the L.T.R.T.A. and home-school staff noted the program's impact on students' self-esteem and overall behavior. Staff members unanimously thought that expectations for both themselves and their students had been met. Classroom teachers enjoyed working with their students on an individual basis and believed that their students academically benefited from small group instruction. They stated that, as a result of the program, they were now able to express themselves more creatively, were using new teaching methods, and enjoyed working with other talented and dedicated teachers. Special education students seemed to especially benefit from participation in the program for two years, and bilingual students were given special, creative opportunities to increase their self-esteem. With the exception of two teachers, all others teachers were enthusiastic about program participation for themselves and their students.

The program had considerably more success this year in its attempt to involve parents. Parents were generally responsive at PAC meetings, and one afternoon meeting attracted 17 parents. They eagerly solicited additional information about citywide assessment, which indicated they were achievement-oriented. They said they discussed the program with their children at home, and bilingual parents noted that their children spoke more English at home.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings the following recommendations are aimed at sustaining and enhancing program effects:

- Because success of the L.T.R.T.A. program depends on highly motivated personnel, all participating classroom teachers should be interested, enthusiastic volunteers, and the L.T.R.T.A. staff should be in a position to encourage the inclusion of such teachers.

- Since the highest number of parents attended an afternoon meeting, this schedule should be considered for continuing parental involvement.

- Since parents' concerns were achievement-oriented, parent meetings should address test-preparation, L.T.R.T.A.-recommended booklists, progress reports, and reinforcement of the program at home.

- The L.T.R.T.A. staff may want to provide parents with suggestions, guidance, and support for follow-up activities for subsequent years, when students will no longer participate in the L.T.R.T.A. Program.

- If possible, all written materials prepared for distribution to parents should be translated into the language used by the parents.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
1985-86

SCHOOL:_____ SITE:_____ GRADE:_____

HOW MANY L.T.R.T.A. CLASSES PER WEEK:_____

1. How many times a week would you like to have L.T.R.T.A. classes?

More than now _____
Less than now _____
Same amount _____
Not sure _____

2a. What do you like best about the L.T.R.T.A. program ?

_____
_____

b. Why do you like this the best?

_____
_____

3a. What do you like least about the L.T.R.T.A. program?

_____
_____

b. Why do you like it the least?

_____
_____

4. a. Since being in L.T.R.T.A., my attendance has

a. gotten better _____
b. stayed the same _____
c. gotten worse _____

b. Since being in L.T.R.T.A., I like coming to school

a. more _____
b. the same _____
c. less _____

c. Since being in L.T.R.T.A., I feel my teachers care

a. more about me _____
b. the same about me _____
c. less about me _____

d. Since being in L.T.R.T.A., I like myself

a. better _____
b. the same _____
c. less _____

e. Since being in L.T.R.T.A., my grades have

a. gotten better _____
b. stayed the same _____
c. gotten worse _____

5. Do you like to read more in school this year than last year?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments: _____
_____
_____

6. When you read now, do you read more for fun? Yes___ No ___

Comments: _____
_____
_____

7. What do you read for fun?

Newspapers _____ Comics _____
Books _____ Other _____
Magazines _____ _____

8a. Do you ever go to the library? Yes _____ No _____

b. If so, why do you go to the library?

_____
_____
_____

9. Since you have been to the L.T.R.T.A. program do you go to the library

more than before _____
as much as before _____
less than before _____
not at all _____

10. Do your parents read with you at home? Yes_____ No _____

11. How often do you parents read with/ or to you at home?

once a day _____
once a week _____
less _____

12. Is there anything else you would like to say about how you feel about the L.T.R.T.A. program?

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS, 1985-86
CLASSROOM TEACHER INTERVIEW FORM

SITE:_____
DATE:_____
TEACHER NAME:_____
SCHOOL:_____ GRADE:_____
OF STUDENTS:_____

Check one:
REGULAR: ____
SPEC. ED: ____
BILINGUAL:____

1. How many years have you participated in the L.T.R.T.A. program?

_____Year/s

2. What did you expect to gain for yourself as a result of program participation?

3. What expectations did you have for your students as a result of program participation?

4. Has the L.T.R.T.A. program met your expectations in both cases?

Yourself:_____

Your students:_____

5. From your perspective, has program participation influenced student behavior and/or learning progress in your classroom? In what ways?

Student behavior: _____

_____

_____

Learning progress: _____

_____

_____

6. What is the greatest improvement in students' capabilities (skills, attitudes) you have noticed? How has this been demonstrated?

_____: _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Do your students, if they are Special Education or bilingual students, seem to especially benefit from the L.T.R.T.A. program? If so, can you describe how?

Does not apply: ____

Special Education: _____

_____

_____

Bilingual: _____

_____

_____

8. Do you have any suggestions for ways your students might benefit more from program participation?

_____

_____

_____

9a. Do you want to participate again in the L.T.R.T.A. program?

Yes _____ No _____

b. Why: _____

10. As a result of L.T.R.T.A. program participation from September to February, rate the following items concerning students' attitudes and behavior?

	great impr.	impr.	no change	dont know
1. Attends school more frequently	____	____	____	____
2. Works on a task until completed	____	____	____	____
3. Works more efficiently when working alone than previously	____	____	____	____
4. Shows greater satisfaction with completed school work and art products	____	____	____	____
5. Takes greater part in class discussion	____	____	____	____
6. Reads a wider range of books than previously	____	____	____	____
7. Talks more about books	____	____	____	____
8. Reads more on own initiative	____	____	____	____
9. Reads more for pleasure	____	____	____	____
10. Has less discipline problems	____	____	____	____

Thank you for your cooperation

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS, 1985-86
STAFF INTERVIEW FORM

DATE:_____ SITE:_____

STAFF POSITION:
Asst. Coordinator _____
Head Teacher _____
Teacher Trainer _____
Artist Teacher _____
Reading Teacher _____
Special Education: Yes ___ No ___

1. How many years have you participated in the L.T.R.T.A. program? _____Year/s

2. What did you expect to gain for yourself as a result of program participation?

3. What expectations did you have for the students as a result of program participation?

4. Has the L.T.R.T.A. program met your expectations in both cases?

Yourself:_____

The students:_____

5. From your perspective, has program participation influenced student behavior and/or learning progress in your workshop? In what ways?

Student behavior: _____

Learning progress:_____

6. What is the greatest improvement in students' capabilities (skills, attitudes) you have noticed? How has this been demonstrated?

_____:_____
_____
_____
_____

7. Do the students,.if they are Special Education or bilingual students, seem to especially benefit from the L.T.R.T.A. program? If so, can you describe how?

Does not apply:_____

Special Education:_____
_____
_____

Bilingual:_____
_____
_____

8. Do you have any suggestions for ways the students might benefit more from program participation?

_____
_____
_____

9. As a result of L.T.R.T.A. program participation from September to February, rate the following items concerning students' attitudes and behavior?

	great impr.	impr.	no change	dont know
1. Works on a task until completed	____	____	____	____
2. Works more efficiently when working alone than previously	____	____	____	____
3. Shows greater satisfaction with completed school work and art products	____	____	____	____
4. Takes greater part in class discussion	____	____	____	____
5. Talks more about books	____	____	____	____
6. Reads more on own initiative	____	____	____	____
7. Reads more for pleasure	____	____	____	____
8. Clearly shows greater self-esteem	____	____	____	____
9. Is more expressive	____	____	____	____
10. Has less discipline problems	____	____	____	____

_____

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT
NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LEARNING TO READ THROUGH THE ARTS, 1985-86
PARENT MEETING OBSERVATION FORM

DATE:_____ SITE:_____ TIME:_____

OF PARENTS PRESENT:_____ EVALUATOR:_____

L.T.R.T.A. STAFF PRESENT:_____
_____
_____

---

1. Does the L.T.R.T.A. program have an agenda? (If so, please attach).

   Yes _____ No _____

2. What is the position of the L.T.R.T.A. staff member who discusses the program? _____

3. What information is given with respect to the L.T.R.T.A. program?

   1. _____
   2. _____
   3. _____
   4. _____
   5. _____

4. What are parents' responses to the speaker?

   _____
   _____
   _____

5. Do parents solicit more information? Yes ___ No ___

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

6. Briefly describe the program discussion of L.T.R.T.A., and include any relevant items not covered in this form.

APPENDIX E

CRITERIA FOR RATING STUDENT RESPONSES*

LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1
Develops the assigned topic in an interesting and imaginative way.			
Demonstrates a logical plan of organization and coherence in the development of ideas.	Develops the assigned topic using an acceptable plan of organization.	Attempts to develop the assigned topic but demonstrates weakness in organization and may include digressions.	Minimally addresses the assigned topic but lacks a plan of organization.
Develops ideas fully through the use of support material (examples, reasons, details, explanations, etc.) that is relevant and appropriate.	Demonstrates satisfactory development of ideas through the use of adequate support material.	Demonstrates weakness in the development of ideas with little use of support material.	Does not use support material in the development of ideas or uses irrelevant mateiral.
Shows skillful use of sentence variety.	Uses some sentence variety.	Demonstrates sentence sense but has little sentence variety.	Demonstrates a lack of sentence sense.
Uses specific, vivid language.	Uses appropriate language.	Occasionally uses inappropriate or incorrect language.	Frequently uses inappropriate or incorrect language.
Makes few or no mechanical erros.	Makes mechanical errors which do not interfere with communication.	Makes mechanical errors which interfere with communication.	Makes mechanical errors which seriously interfere with communication.

*from Supplementary Training Packet for Holistic Scoring, New York City Board of Education, Spring, 1985

*Minor revisions have been made in these criteria since they were first published in the Writing Test for New York State Elementary Schools, Rater Training Packet, Fall 1982.

ZERO PAPER: Is totally unrelated to the topic; or
Is illegible, i.e., includes so many indecipherable words that no sense can be made of the response; or
Is incoherent, i.e., words are legible but syntax is so garbled that no sense can be made of the response; or
Is a blank paper.

Appendix F

L.T.R.T.A. Student Questionnaire Question 13

The following anecdotes reflect students' feelings about the L.T.R.T.A. program:

Second Graders:

"The program helps me to learn things. I feel happy and excited to come. I am learning how to play the piano and all about art."

"I like the program very much and want to become a ballerina."

"I like the teachers, they teach real good and give us pretzels."

"My mother says I am improving with my reading, and the teachers are nice."

"It is good and fun and I get to learn more; it's a nice school."

Third graders:

"I like the teachers, they teach us how to respect teachers."

"I like the program and will never forget it."

"People in this program are very polite. They never yell at us and we like to win points to be the best class."

"I am happy that I came here, even though we leave after 3:00. It makes me feel special to come."

"The teachers are so nice, I wish I could come every day."

Fourth graders:

"When I feel happy I share my thoughts with the teachers. Ms. A is good, because she is interested in my life and I feel very loved."

"I like the singing and I feel like an artist when I take my work home and hang it up."

"I feel happy to be here. My friends ask me where I am going and I tell them I am in this program."

"I like the way the reading teachers introduces interesting things, like microscopes. And the art teacher brings in plants."

"I feel like this is my rest school; I learned how to do a 'worm' in dance. I get to eat pretzels and the teacher reads to us."

"The teachers help us learn. The reading teacher tells us about things as where my classroom teacher only asks questions."

"The teachers respect me and I respect them."

Fifth graders:

"At first I did not like it, but now I love it. It makes me feel proud."

"I feel looser, I do more things now. When I first started I didn't go anywhere. Now I am all over the place." (The student is referring to trips, library visits, etc. -- Ed.)

"If I could get out earlier I would like the program."

"I get more allowance when I go home and read to my parents."

"Sometimes it is fun. I practice dancing at home and my mother comes to see me in school."

Sixth graders:

"I like the teachers, they treat me well and help me when I ask for help."

"It is a very good program, because it helps people how to read and write and get passing grades, so that we can become somebody in the future."